

REMARKS

Since the due date of February 14, 2004 for responding to the present Office Action fell on a weekend, and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office was closed on Monday, February 16, 2004 in observance of a Federal Holiday, the present Amendment is timely filed without an extension of time fee.

An excess claim fee payment letter is submitted herewith for one (1) excess total claim and two (2) excess independent claims.

Claims 1-21 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1-9 have been amended merely to make minor editorial changes in accordance with U.S. patent practice. Claims 10-21 have been added to claim additional features of the invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability.

Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected on prior art grounds under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Flowers, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5, 533,174; hereinafter "Flowers").

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

**I. THE PRESENT INVENTION**

The claimed invention is directed to a data communication system.

In the illustrative, non-limiting embodiment of the present invention, as defined by independent claim 1, the data communication system includes a client computer and a server being capable of communicating data with each other, wherein the client computer includes a first font transmitting unit for transmitting font information data representing fonts capable of being output at the client computer; and wherein the server includes a first receiving unit for receiving the font information data that has been transmitted from the first font transmitting unit of the client computer. The data communication system also includes a font search unit for searching for fonts, which are capable of being output at the client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at the server, on the basis of fonts represented by the font

information data that has been received by the first receiving unit, and a second font transmitting unit for transmitting font information data representing the fonts, which have been found by the font search unit, to the client computer.

An exemplary embodiment of the present invention, as defined by independent claim 6, is directed to a client computer capable of communicating data with a server, wherein font information data representing fonts capable of being output at the client computer are transmitted from the client computer to the server, and the server searches fonts capable of being output at the server for fonts capable of being output at the client computer based upon fonts represented by the font information data that has been transmitted from the client computer, and transmits font information data representing the fonts that have been found to the client computer.

Another exemplary embodiment of the present invention, as defined by independent claim 7, is directed to a server capable of communicating data with a client computer, including a receiving unit for receiving font information data transmitted from the client computer and representing fonts capable of being output at the client computer, a search unit for searching for fonts, which are capable of being output at the client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at the server, on the basis of fonts represented by the font information data that has been received by the first receiving unit.

An exemplary embodiment of the present invention, as defined by independent claim 8, is directed to a method of controlling a server which communicates data with a client computer, including receiving font information data that has been transmitted from the client computer and that represents fonts capable of being output at the client computer, searching for fonts, which are capable of being output at the client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at the server, on the basis of fonts represented by the font information data that has been received, and transmitting font information data representing the fonts that have been found to the client computer.

An exemplary embodiment of the present invention, as defined by independent claim 9, is directed to a computer-readable recording medium storing a program for controlling a client computer capable of communicating with a server, wherein the client computer transmits font information data representing fonts capable of being output at the client computer to the server and the server searches fonts capable of being output at the server for

fonts capable of being output at the client computer based upon fonts represented by the font information data that has been transmitted from the client computer.

Thus, according to the illustrative, non-limiting embodiments of the claimed invention, fonts can be employed that are usable at both a client computer and a server.

As such, the present invention facilitates, for example, the creation of images at the client computer having the subject fonts and which can be edited using the client computer, while ensuring that the edited images having the subject fonts can be printed by a printer connected to the server (e.g., see specification at page 2, lines 2-6, see also page 17, lines 8-13).

## II. CLAIM REJECTION BASED ON PRIOR ART GROUNDS

Claims 1-9 stand rejected on prior art grounds under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Flowers. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a data communication system comprising:

wherein said client computer includes a first font transmitting unit for transmitting font information data representing fonts capable of being output at said client computer; and

wherein said server comprises a first receiving unit for receiving the font information data that has been transmitted from said first font transmitting unit of said client computer;

a font search unit for searching for fonts, which are capable of being output at said client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at said server, on the basis of fonts represented by the font information data that has been received by said first receiving unit;... (emphasis added).

That is, the client computer includes a first font transmitting unit for transmitting font information data representing fonts capable of being output at the client computer. The font information data representing fonts capable of being output at the client computer is transmitted to the server from the client computer. The server receives the font information data and, on the basis of the fonts represented by this received font information data, searches for fonts capable of being output at the client computer among the fonts capable of being output at the server. Accordingly, fonts capable of being output at both the client computer

and the server are found.

In contrast, Flowers merely discloses a network font server. In Flowers, a request for a list of catalogues is sent to a font server 16 from a client (work station 12, printer 14), and the server supplies to the client, a list of all catalogues available to the client. The client sends a request for a list of the fonts within a particular catalogue which have one or more particular characteristics, such as fonts designed by a certain designer and so forth or a request for a list of the characteristics of the fonts in a particular catalogue. In response to such queries, the font server 16 returns a list of fonts and the client either selects a font or continues to send queries to the server for further information (e.g., see Flowers at column 9, lines 35-44).

Further, the client may ask the font server 16 to provide a list of the fonts which meet particular printing/display requirements. The client can then select a font from the list. The designer of the application software selects the types of queries which are made, such that a font which supports the application's display and printing requirements is selected. If none of the available fonts meet these requirements, the requirements are revised and a font which best meets the revised requirements is selected (e.g., see Flowers at column 9, lines 52-60).

In Flowers, although the list of all catalogues available to the client is sent to the client from the server, the list of all catalogues available to the client (or server) is not sent to the server (or client) from the client (or server).

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Flowers neither discloses nor suggests all of the recitations of independent claim 1, or for that matter, dependent claims 2-5. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 and permit these claims to pass to allowance.

With respect to independent claim 6, Applicant submits that Flowers neither discloses nor suggests all of the recitations of claim 6.

Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, "font information data representing fonts capable of being output at said client computer are transmitted from said client computer to said server."

For reasons similar to those set forth above, Flowers neither discloses nor suggests at least this feature. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 6.

With respect to independent claim 7, Applicant submits that Flowers neither discloses

nor suggests all of the recitations of claim 7.

Independent claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, “a receiving unit for receiving font information data transmitted from said client computer and representing fonts capable of being output at said client computer.”

For reasons similar to those set forth above, Flowers neither discloses nor suggests at least this feature. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 7.

With respect to independent claim 8, Applicant submits that Flowers neither discloses nor suggests all of the recitations of claim 8.

Independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “receiving font information data that has been transmitted from the client computer and that represents fonts capable of being output at said client computer.”

For reasons similar to those set forth above, Flowers neither discloses nor suggests at least this feature. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 8.

With respect to independent claim 9, Applicant submits that Flowers neither discloses nor suggests all of the recitations of claim 9.

Independent claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, that “the client computer transmits font information data representing fonts capable of being output at said client computer to the server.”

For reasons similar to those set forth above, Flowers neither discloses nor suggests at least this feature. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Flowers neither discloses nor suggests all of the recitations of claims 1-9. Therefore, claims 1-9 are neither anticipated by, nor rendered from, the Flowers reference.

### III. NEW CLAIMS

New claims 10-21 are added to provide more varied protection for the present invention. Claims 10-21 are supported by the original disclosure, for example, at pages 4-5, bridging paragraph, pages 8-9, bridging paragraph, and page 17, first full paragraph.

Applicant submits that claims 10-21 are patentable over the cited reference for at least reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claims 1-9, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein.

#### **IV. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of the priority documents filed on August 21, 2000, at page 2, second paragraph, of the Office Action. However, Applicant requests that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f) and indicate that all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received on the Office Action Summary by checking the appropriate boxes (i.e., blocks 13(a)(1)).

Applicant also requests that the Examiner indicate that the drawings filed on August 21, 2000, are accepted and approved by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-21, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

Serial No. 09/641,730  
Docket No. 5-006US-FF

14

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: February 17, 2004

  
John J. Dresch, Esq.

Registration No. 46,672

  
Sean M. McGinn, Esq.

Registration No. 34,386

**McGinn & Gibb, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**